

want an abundant food supply. They hope it would be reasonably priced. But most assuredly, they want to know that it is safe and it is reliable. The only way to guarantee that is that it be harvested in this country, as it has been from the beginning history of our great country. It was not for 2 months last year and possibly not for 6 months this year.

We have a choice to make. We either create a legal workforce, a workforce that is identifiable, or we keep stumbling down this road that no American wants us to go down, and that is to not control our borders, to not identify the foreign nationals within our borders, and to not have a reasonable, legal, and timely process. That is what the debate is all about.

I am pleased to see the other side, having been in opposition for so long, finally say, Whoa, I think maybe we ought to try to get this right. We disagree on process, we disagree on their approach, but there is similarity in many instances on reform of the H-2A program. We will work over the course of this afternoon, evening, and tomorrow to break all those differences out so all of our Senators can see these differences and sense the importance of what we debate.

There are many others who have come to the floor to discuss this legislation this afternoon. I yield the floor so the debate can proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the proposal offered by Senators CRAIG and KENNEDY. I see Senator KENNEDY on the floor and Senator CRAIG on the floor. Their work is a testament to their persistence and the staying power of a handful of agricultural workers and employers who have been willing to set aside ideology and partisanship to hammer out a major overhaul of our law in this area.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a procedural question?

Mr. WYDEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Oregon, we have the Senator from Massachusetts here, and the Senator from Alabama has been here, as has the Senator from Georgia been on the floor when there was no one else present. I wonder if we can get some general agreement of going back and forth between proponents or opponents or proponents of the two separate bills so the Chair has some idea of order and the debate participants do as well.

I offer this as a suggestion. I have not proposed a unanimous consent request, but perhaps some of the staff can work this out while the Senator from Oregon is speaking.

Mr. CRAIG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KYL. Yes.

Mr. CRAIG. Because our debate time, as I understand it, is actually tomorrow, and I think we will go off and on

this issue today, and because the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is on the floor managing the supplemental and may have other amendments he wants to deal with, I would hope we can rely on the Chair for moving us back and forth in a balanced way from side to side before we look at a structured way to proceed. I have difficulty with that.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Arizona in his request. I think it is important if we are to spend most of the afternoon on the issue. If we could work out an orderly arrangement, that would be good.

Mr. KYL. Let me propose this unanimous consent, Mr. President, if I may. The Senator from Oregon is speaking right now. I ask unanimous consent that after the Senator from Oregon is finished, so there would have been two Members speaking on behalf of the legislation of the Senator from Idaho, that at that point, the debate next go back and forth between proponents of the Chambliss-Kyl amendment and then back to Kennedy-Craig, and anyone offering an amendment can obviously seek to ask unanimous consent to lay the pending business aside, but in the meantime the debate on these two provisions that will both be voted upon tomorrow proceed with speakers on either side rotating.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I see my friend from New Mexico who was here before I was here. Let him proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I have two amendments to offer, and it will take a total of about 3 minutes. I do not expect votes on them today, of course, but I would like a chance to very briefly offer them, and then have them set aside, if I can do that after the Senator from Oregon concludes his remarks and before the rest of the debate continues.

Mr. KYL. That is accommodated in the unanimous consent request which I proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Reserving the right to object, I welcome the opportunity to work this out. Can we perhaps get some time understanding as well? The Senator from Oregon mentioned he will probably need 15 minutes. Could we get some kind of understanding about the length of time? Generally we go from Republican to Democrat. Now we are looking at going from proponents to opponents. I do not mind that, but if we can limit this to 15 minutes each—I see we have a number of people—would that be agreeable? So we would go to Senator WYDEN, and because the Senator from Arizona has been so persuasive, we will hear two on his side, and maybe Senator BINGAMAN can be recognized after Senator WYDEN, and

then two for the Senator's side, 15 minutes each, and then I be recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KYL. I am happy to have my unanimous consent request amended along the lines of what the Senator from Massachusetts said.

Mr. CRAIG. It is clear anybody coming to the floor to offer amendments to the supplemental would have that right.

Mr. KYL. They could ask unanimous consent to intervene, and obviously it will be granted.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KYL. Let me propound the unanimous consent request again, if I can. I ask unanimous consent that in 15-minute blocks of time Senator WYDEN proceed without any of this time coming off his, there then be two 15-minute blocks for the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Georgia, followed by a 15-minute block for the Senator from Massachusetts, but in the meantime, Senator BINGAMAN be able to offer his amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, a remarkable coalition of agricultural employers and farm workers has come together behind the Craig-Kennedy amendment. I commend them for all of their efforts. I simply wanted to spend a few minutes and talk about a bit of lineage behind this whole effort.

To some extent, this began on the afternoon of July 23, 1998, when I had the opportunity to join with my friend and colleague Senator Gordon Smith and we offered an amendment to overhaul this program. It was, in fact, entitled the AgJOBS amendment. It had the strong support of Senator CRAIG at that time. We received 68 votes for that legislation. I think it was an indication then, as we see today, how the system works for no one.

To a great extent, we see so many who feel we have lost control of our borders. The system surely does not work for the honest agricultural employer, and the vast majority certainly meet that test, and for many farm workers who work hard and contribute every single day. The system simply does not work for anyone. So what Senator SMITH and I tried to do that July day in 1998 was to begin to address the foundation of a sensible immigration policy based on the proposition that what we have been doing does not work for anybody. It does not work for our country.

We live under a contradiction every day with respect to immigration. We say we are against illegal immigration. One can hear that in every coffee shop in the United States. Then we look the other way so as to deal with agriculture or perhaps motels, hotels, restaurants, and a variety of other establishments. We have to resolve that contradiction. We ought to resolve it by making the kind of start the Craig-Kennedy legislation does by saying we